

The Examiner has required that the applicants provide a list of the claims which read on the elected species. For this purpose it is assumed that a species encompasses only user interfaces identical to those in the figure, and not ones which are merely similar.

In that case, it is believed that apparatus claims 1-17, 20-21, 23-43, and 49 read on the elected species. Claim 18 does not read on the elected species because the user interface in Figure 3A is based on the user pressing buttons depicted in the Figure and not sound activation as recited in claim 18 (although one could conceive of a system which has a user interface as in Figure 3A and, in addition, has sound activation as an alternate or backup user interface). Claim 19 depends on claim 18. Claim 22 does not read on the elected species because the gas flow display in Figure 3A is digital and claim 22 requires an analog display.

It is further believed that method claims 44-48 may be practiced with the user interface depicted in Figure 3A.

Conclusion. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this communication, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at (650) 251-7712 (direct dial).

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Flavio M. Rose
Registration No. 40,791
c/o MINTZ LEVIN
1400 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, California 94304-1124
(650) 251-7700 Telephone
(650) 251-7739 Facsimile
Customer Number 23980